

ON THE GRINBERG – KAZHDAN FORMAL ARC THEOREM

VLADIMIR DRINFELD

Let X be a scheme of finite type over a field k , and $X^\circ \subset X$ the smooth part of X . Consider the scheme $\mathcal{L}(X)$ of formal arcs in X . The k -points of $\mathcal{L}(X)$ are just maps $\mathrm{Spec} k[[t]] \rightarrow X$. Let $\mathcal{L}^\circ(X)$ be the open subscheme of arcs whose image is not contained in $X \setminus X^\circ$. Fix an arc $\gamma_0 : \mathrm{Spec} k[[t]] \rightarrow X$ in $\mathcal{L}^\circ(X)$, and let $\mathcal{L}(X)_{\gamma_0}$ be the formal neighborhood of γ_0 in $\mathcal{L}(X)$. We will give a simple proof of the following theorem, which was proved by M. Grinberg and D. Kazhdan [GK] for fields k of characteristic 0.

Theorem 0.1. *There exists a scheme $Y = Y(\gamma_0)$ of finite type over k , and a point $y \in Y(k)$, such that $\mathcal{L}(X)_{\gamma_0}$ is isomorphic to $D^\infty \times Y_y$ where Y_y is the formal neighborhood of y in Y and D^∞ is the product of countably many copies of the formal disk $D := \mathrm{Spf} k[[t]]$.*

A convention. Throughout this paper, a *test-ring* A is a local commutative unital k -algebra with residue field k whose maximal ideal m is nilpotent. If S is a scheme over k and $p \in S(k)$ is a k -point we think of the formal neighborhood S_p in terms of its functor of points $A \mapsto S_p(A)$ from test-rings to sets. For instance, A -points of $\mathcal{L}(X)_{\gamma_0}$ are $A[[t]]$ -points of X whose reduction modulo m equals γ_0 .

Remark. $\mathcal{L}(X)_{\gamma_0} = \mathcal{L}(X_1)_{\gamma_0}$ where $X_1 \subset X$ is the closure of the connected component of X° containing $\gamma_0(\mathrm{Spec} k((t)))$. So we can assume that X is reduced and irreducible. But Y is, in general, neither reduced nor irreducible (e.g., see the following example).

Example. X is the hypersurface $yx_{n+1} + f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ and $\gamma_0(t)$ is defined by $x_{n+1}^0(t) = t, y^0(t) = x_1^0(t) = \dots = x_n^0(t) = 0$. Then one can define Y to be the hypersurface $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ and y to be the point $0 \in Y$. Indeed, by the Weierstrass division theorem (alias preparatory lemma) for any test-ring A every A -deformation of $x_{n+1}^0(t) = t$ has the form $x_{n+1}(t) = (t - \alpha)u(t)$ where α belongs to the maximal ideal $m \subset A$ and $u \in A[[t]]$ is invertible. Given α, u , and $x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t) \in m[[t]]$ there is at most one $y(t) \in m[[t]]$ such that $y(t)x_{n+1}(t) + f(x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t)) = 0$, and $y(t)$ exists if and only if $f(x_1(\alpha), \dots, x_n(\alpha)) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 0.1. We can assume that X is a closed subvariety of an affine space. Then there is a closed subscheme X' of the affine space such that $X' \supset X$, X' is a complete intersection, and the image of our arc γ_0 is not contained in the closure of $X' \setminus X$. Clearly $\mathcal{L}(X)_{\gamma_0} = \mathcal{L}(X')_{\gamma_0}$, so we can assume that $X = X'$ is the

Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0100108.

subscheme of $\text{Spec } k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_l]$ defined by equations $p_1 = \dots = p_l = 0$ such that the arc $\gamma_0(t) = (x^0(t), y^0(t)) = (x_1^0(t), \dots, x_n^0(t), y_1^0(t), \dots, y_l^0(t))$ is not contained in the subvariety of X defined by $\det \frac{\partial p}{\partial y} = 0$. Here $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ is the matrix of partial derivatives $\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial y_j}$. Let γ be an A -deformation of γ_0 for some test-ring A , so $\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t))$, where $x(t) \in A[[t]]^n$, $y(t) \in A[[t]]^l$. Then by the Weierstrass division theorem (alias preparatory lemma) $\det \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), y(t))$ has a unique representation as $q(t)u(t)$ where $u \in A[[t]]$ is invertible and q is a monic polynomial whose reduction modulo the maximal ideal $m \subset A$ is a power of t . Let d denote the degree of q ; it depends only on γ_0 , not on its deformation γ . We assume that $d > 0$ (otherwise we can eliminate y). The idea is to consider q as one of the unknowns. More precisely, A -deformations of γ_0 are identified with solutions of the following system of equations. The unknowns are $q(t) \in A[t]$, $x(t) \in A[[t]]^n$, and $y(t) \in A[[t]]^l$ such that q is monic of degree d , $q(t)$ is congruent to t^d modulo m , and the reduction of $(x(t), y(t))$ modulo m equals $\gamma_0(t) = (x^0(t), y^0(t))$. The equations are as follows:

$$(1) \quad \det \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), y(t)) \equiv 0 \pmod{q},$$

$$(2) \quad p(x(t), y(t)) = 0,$$

where $p := (p_1, \dots, p_l)$. (Notice that if (1) is satisfied then $q(t)^{-1} \det \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), y(t))$ is automatically invertible because it is invertible modulo m).

Now fix $r \geq 1$ and consider the following system of equations. The unknowns are $q(t) \in A[t]$, $x(t) \in A[[t]]^n$, and $\bar{y} \in A[t]^l/(q^r)$ such that q is monic of degree d , $q(t)$ is congruent to t^d modulo m , the reduction of $x(t)$ modulo m equals $x^0(t)$, and the reduction of $\bar{y}$ modulo m equals the reduction of y^0 modulo t^r . The equations are as follows:

$$(3) \quad \det \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), \bar{y}) \equiv 0 \pmod{q},$$

$$(4) \quad p(x(t), \bar{y}) \in \text{Im} \left(q^r \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), \bar{y}) : A[t]^l / qA[t]^l \rightarrow q^r A[t]^l / q^{r+1} A[t]^l \right).$$

Condition (4) makes sense because $p(x(t), \bar{y})$ is well defined modulo $\text{Im } q^r \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), \bar{y})$. Notice that (4) is indeed an equation because it is equivalent to the condition $\hat{C}p(x(t), y(t)) \equiv 0 \pmod{q^{r+1}}$ where $y(t) \in A[t]^l$ is a preimage of $\bar{y}$ and $\hat{C}$ is the matrix adjugate to $C := \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), y(t))$ (so $C\hat{C} = \hat{C}C = \det C$). This condition is equivalent to the following equations, which do not involve a choice of $y(t) \in A[t]^l$ such that $y(t) \mapsto \bar{y}$:

$$(5) \quad p(x(t), \bar{y}) \equiv 0 \pmod{q^r},$$

$$(6) \quad \hat{B}p(x(t), \bar{y}) \equiv 0 \pmod{q^{r+1}},$$

where $B := \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), \bar{y})$; notice that (6) makes sense as soon as (5) holds.

Lemma 0.2. *The natural map from the set of solutions of (1-2) to the set of solutions of (3-4) is bijective.*

Proof. Let a be the minimal number such that $m^a = 0$. We proceed by induction on a , so we can assume that $a \geq 2$ and the lemma is proved for A/m^{a-1} . Then there exists $\tilde{y}(t) \in A[t]^l$ such that $\tilde{y} \bmod q^r = \bar{y}$ and $p(x(t), \tilde{y}(t)) \in m^{a-1}[t]^l$; such $\tilde{y}$ is unique modulo $q^r A[t]^l \cap m^{a-1}[t]^l$. We have to find $z(t) \in q^r A[t]^l \cap m^{a-1}[t]^l$ such that $p(x(t), \tilde{y}(t) - z(t)) = 0$, i.e., $Cz(t) = p(x(t), \tilde{y}(t))$, where $C := \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x(t), \tilde{y}(t))$. (3) implies that $\det C = q(t)u(t)$ for some invertible $u \in A[t]$. So $z(t)$ is unique. By (4) $p(x(t), \tilde{y}(t)) \in q^r C A[t]^l + q^{r+1} A[t]^l$. But $C A[t]^l \supset (\det C) A[t]^l = q A[t]^l$, so $p(x(t), \tilde{y}(t)) = Cz(t)$ for some $z(t) \in q^r A[t]^l$. We have $Cz(t) = p(x(t), \tilde{y}(t)) \equiv 0 \bmod m^{a-1}$, so $q(t)z(t) \equiv 0 \bmod m^{a-1}$ and finally $q(t) \equiv 0 \bmod m^{a-1}$. $\square$

So the set of A -deformations of γ_0 can be identified with the set of solutions of the system (3-4). This system is essentially finite because $x(t)$ is relevant only modulo q^{r+1} . E.g., if $r = 1$ we can write $x(t)$ as $q^2(t)\xi(t) + \bar{x}$, $\xi \in A[[t]]^n$, $\bar{x} \in A[t]^n$, $\deg \bar{x} < 2d$, and consider $\xi(t)$, $\bar{x}$, $q(t)$, and $\bar{y}$ to be the unknowns (rather than $x(t)$, $q(t)$, $\bar{y}$); then (3-4) becomes a finite system of equations for q , $\bar{x}$, $\bar{y}$ (and ξ is not involved in these equations). So $\mathcal{L}(X)_{\gamma_0}$ is isomorphic to $D^\infty \times Y_y$, where the k -scheme Y of finite type and the point $y \in Y(k)$ are defined as follows: for every k -algebra R the set $Y(R)$ consists of triples $(q, \bar{x}, \bar{y})$ where $q \in R[t]$ is monic of degree d , $\bar{x} \in R[t]^n/(q^2)$, $\bar{y} \in R[t]^l/(q)$, $\det B \equiv 0 \bmod q$, $B := \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \equiv 0 \bmod q$, and $\hat{B}p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \equiv 0 \bmod q^2$; $y \in Y(k)$ corresponds to $q = t^d$, $\bar{x} = x^0(t) \bmod t^{2d}$, $\bar{y} = y^0(t) \bmod t^d$. $\square$

Remark. The above proof goes back to Finkelberg and Mirković [FM]. They proved Theorem 0.1 in the particular case that X is the affine closure of G/N , where G is a reductive group and N is the unipotent radical of a Borel subgroup $B \subset G$. Their main idea is to choose an opposite Borel subgroup $B_- \subset G$ such that the image of γ_0 has non-empty intersection with the open orbit of B_- in X . Our proof makes an implicit use of a certain smooth groupoids Γ_r , $r \geq 1$, of dimension $n = \dim X$ acting on X so that there exists a closed Γ_r -invariant subscheme $Y \subset X$ with the following properties: $Y \subset X$ is defined by one equation, the action of Γ_r on $X \setminus Y$ is transitive, and the image of γ_0 is not contained in Y . More precisely, our $X \subset \operatorname{Spec} k[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_l]$ is assumed to be a complete intersection $p_1 = \dots = p_l = 0$ and $Q := \det \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$. I will explicitly describe Γ_r in a subsequent version of this paper; here I am just going to indicate that the corresponding Lie algebroid is generated by the vector fields v_i on X such that $v_i(x_j) = Q^r \delta_{ij}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

REFERENCES

- [FM] M. Finkelberg, I. Mirković, *Semiinfinite flags. I. Case of global curve P^1* , Differential topology, infinite-dimensional Lie algebras, and applications, 81–112, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, 194, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999. See also e-print alg-geom/9707010.
- [GK] M. Grinberg and D. Kazhdan, *Versal deformations of formal arcs*, Geometric and Functional Analysis, vol. 10 (2000), no. 3, 543–555. See also e-print math.AG/9812104.

DEPT. OF MATH., UNIV. OF CHICAGO, 5734 UNIVERSITY AVE., CHICAGO, IL 60637
E-mail address: `drinfeld@math.uchicago.edu`